DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 110 AC 008 397

AUTHOR	Oliver, Leonard P.
TITLE	Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965: Its Promise and Performance. Abstract of a Dissertation ...
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill.
PUB DATE	Jul 70
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education, Attitudes, Community Service Programs, Doctoral Theses, *Federal Legislation, *Higher Education, Historical Reviews, Investigations, Perception, Policy Formation, Problems, Program Administration, *Program Evaluation, *University Extension
IDENTIFIERS	Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title I)

ABSTRACT

This work examined the origins of Title 1, Higher Education Act of 1965; and evaluated the status of its continuing education and community service programs as seen (1969) by administrators and others active in the program. The struggle for Federal aid to higher general education began with a general extension bill introduced into Congress in 1940. Title 1 finally emerged in 1965, not as general extension, but as a plan to solve community problems by strengthening continuing education and extension methods. Most survey respondents' general reactions to Title 1 were favorable, but half thought the program would have trouble surviving. About 2/3 cited increased institution community involvement as a major outcome; over half felt Title 1 had helped solve some acute community problems. However, interpretations of Title 1 varied widely, and the act itself was unclear as to who should set program priorities. Special problems in funding, advising, and administration were also noted. (This doctoral thesis will be available from the Dept. of Photoduplication, University of Chicago Library, Swift Hall, Chicago, Ill. 60637.) (LY)

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965: ITS PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED042110

ABSTRACT

OF

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BY

LEONARD P. OLIVER

JULY, 1970

AC008397

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

TITLE: Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965: Its Promise and Performance

NAME AND SPECIAL FIELD: Leonard P. Oliver
Adult Education

COMMITTEE: Cyril O. Houle, Chairman
Robert L. McCaul
Norman Burns

INTRODUCTION TO TITLE I

The "Higher Education Act of 1965,"[1] designed to aid colleges, teachers, students, and communities, was one of the most important federal aid to higher education measures of the sixties. It contained eight major titles, one of which, Title I, provided for community service and continuing education programs in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and four territories. The specific purpose of the act was to assist the people of the United States

> in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants . . . to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities. . . .[2]

State agencies, state advisory councils, widespread institutional participation, and a comprehensive, coordinated state plan for community service were among the most important features of Title I. Any educational activity or service designed to assist in the solution of community problems in urban, suburban, or rural areas could fall within the scope of the program. Title I had a five-year authorization, but Congress authorized funding for only three years—$25 million for the first fiscal year and $50 million for each of the succeeding two years. Actual appropriations, however, did not exceed $10 million for any one fiscal year. The higher education amendments of 1968 altered some of these provisions; they extended Title I for one additional year, set funding levels for the final three years at $10 million, $50 million, and $60 million respectively, and modified the requirement for comprehensive statewide systems of community service if there were insufficient resources available to carry out this provision in a state.[3]

---

[1] Higher Education Act of 1965, Statutes at Large, LXXIX, 1219-24 (1965); U.S. Code, Supplement 1 of the 1964 edition, 328-31 (1965).

[2] Ibid., Sec. 101.

[3] U.S. Congress, Senate, Higher Education Amendments of 1968, Pub. L. 90-575, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1968, S. 3769, Sec. 201-203. See also Higher Education Amendments of 1968, Statutes at Large, LXXXII, 1035-36 (1968).

By mid-1969, the nationwide Title I program was beginning its fifth year of operation, and according to the annual reports of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education,[1] its achievements were noteworthy. A national pattern of state agencies and advisory councils had been established, more than 700 colleges and universities had become involved through approximately 2,500 projects, and more than two million adults had been reached with the community service programming. The federal government had spent $34.4 million, matched by $22.3 million of local funds for a four-year total of $56.7 million. The content of the projects was diverse, covering all the problem areas stated in the act and four additional areas added in the course of the program's operation—human relations, personal development, economic development, and community development.[2] This evidence indicates that the Title I program appeared to at least have made a start towards the fulfillment of its statement of purpose.

THE PROBLEM AND THE RESEARCH DESIGN

After four years of program experience, the Title I effort had not risen to central prominence in the eyes of either the administration or Congress, and had not received anywhere near its full congressional authorization. It had not developed high social visibility, it could not claim a large and articulate constituency, and it had received harsh criticism both from those responsible for the administration and operation of the program and from those on the periphery of such operations. These were the most important problems the program faced as it moved into its final two years.

Reviewing the development under Title I since its enactment in 1965, it is apparent that the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) administrators made a major effort to get the Title I program underway in the first six months of 1966. By the following year, criticism of the program was beginning to appear. A special study of the USOE, conducted in 1967 by the House's subcommittee on education,[3]

---

[1]The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education was charged under Title I with overseeing the Title I program, and with reviewing the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension programs.

[2]National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, Higher Education and Community Service: Fourth Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1970), pp. 20-27, passim.

[3]U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Study of the United States Office of Education, Report of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. Doc. 193, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1967, pp. 345-53.

referred to Title I and pointed to the inattention given to urban-suburban problem solving; the low number of institutions, especially private colleges, participating in the program; and the confusion over the act's purposes. A survey by a private research firm in late 1967 reported similar findings, adding that

> the act has two major objectives: 1) "the solution of community problems," and 2) "strengthening community service programs of colleges and universities." There are variations in the manner in which these two objectives are interpreted and implemented, and there is need to clarify these concepts.[1]

Also, Title I was being treated with indifference and apathy at the annual meetings of the National University Extension Association (NUEA) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). It was only in the Community Development Division of the NUEA that Title I was given extensive attention, with the division giving over part of its annual meetings from 1966 on to a consideration of the progress and problems of Title I. Those who addressed the division tended to decry safe and easy projects; the proliferation of uncoordinated, discrete projects; the lack of systematic approaches to problem solving; and the absence of strong leadership for Title I programming at all operating levels.

The national advisory council's report for fiscal year 1969 (ending June 30, 1969) expressed a sense of urgency because the Title I authorization had been dropped from the fiscal year 1971 budget proposals. The council recommended reinstatement of Title I's authorization at not less than the $.5 million it had received in the previous year.[2] Thus, Title I was in danger of being terminated with one year to go; its future remained clouded and uncertain to those closest to its national operation and to those who had closely followed its progress.

Given this background, the purpose of the present investigation was to gain insight into and understanding of the Title I phenomenon in order to provide those individuals and groups who can wield influence over the program with a firm base for determining policy alternatives. In a search for other investigations into Title I, it was found that no investigations had been conducted into the broad dimensions of the Title I experience, although several investigators had examined

---

[1] Greenleigh Associates, Inc., Federally Supported Community Service and Continuing Education Programs: A Five-State Survey (New York: Greenleigh Associates, Inc., 1967), p. 5.

[2] National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, Fourth Annual Report, pp. 1-4.

certain aspects of the act's history or its performance in a single state.[1] The search for an appropriate research design to investigate the Title I experience, therefore, led to a number of studies recently conducted on federal aid to education programs. Bailey and Mosher's examination of the implementation of the Elementary-Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA)[2] was helpful, but a recent line of inquiry established at the University of Chicago provided the basic design. Kearney[3] looked at the influence of a presidential task force on the development of the ESEA prior to enactment, Colton[4] studied the role of a state agency in educational policy by going to those individuals responsible for carrying out policy.

Each of these investigators dealt with recently enacted educational legislation, each used documentary search and depth interview techniques to gather his data, and each approached his project without a rigorous a priori conceptual design. Using these techniques in tandem helped these researchers to probe to develop the major threads running through the complex processes of federal aid to education.

With these techniques in mind, the present investigator decided to use a two-stage approach in the study of Title I, including a historical phase with documentary search to examine the origins of the act, and a field study phase using depth interviewing to assess the status of the program four years after enactment. The investigation was guided by the following questions:

1. Are there factors in the history leading up to the enactment of Title I which, if known, would contribute to an understanding of the Title I national, state, and local program?

---

[1]See, for example Russell Kleis, "The Struggle for Federal Support for General University Extension, 1940-1965"(Ph.D. dissertation in progress, The Department of Education, The University of Chicago); and Robert J. Senecal, "Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965: A Study of Program Compliance With Congressional Intent" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, The University of Iowa, 1969).

[2]Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1968).

[3]C. Philip Kearney, "The Presidential Task Force on Education and the Elementary-Secondary Act of 1965" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Department of Education, The University of Chicago, 1967).

[4]David L. Colton, "State Power and Local Decision-Making: A Case Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Department of Education, The University of Chicago, 1967).

2. Are there factors in the opinions and attitudes of those individuals currently holding some responsibility for the Title I program which, if known, would contribute to an understanding of the Title I national, state, and local program?

3. Would the contrast between the factors present in the history leading up to enactment and opinions and attitudes in the field four years later yield additional insights into the Title I program and perhaps contribute to ways to strengthen the program's impact and increase its visibility in the Congress and the administration?

THE HISTORICAL PHASE

The Methodology

The historical phase of this study included a search of primary congressional documents related to the historical development of Title I, using accepted canons of historical method and historiography,[1] and covering the period from 1940 when the first general extension bill was introduced into Congress to 1965 when Title I was enacted. Only primary documents were used because a preliminary review of some of these documents indicated that sufficient data were available. The primary sources consulted included texts of the bills, transcripts of committee hearings, committee reports, miscellaneous congressional publications, and the Congressional Record. Other information which bears on this history could be found in secondary sources such as the literature of the field of adult education and in statements of those adult educators and others who were involved in the struggle to obtain federal aid, but investigation of these sources was beyond the scope of the present investigation.

The Twenty-Five Year Struggle for Federal Aid for Higher Adult Education

The struggle for federal aid for general support of higher adult education, or general extension, began in 1940 with the introduction of the first university general extension bill into Congress.[2] Almost identical bills were introduced into eight subsequent sessions of Congress. These bills sought

---

[1]Gottschalk's basic work on historical methodology was utilized to ensure proper treatment of the data gathered in this phase. See Louis Gottschalk, Understanding History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963). Also used at various stages was Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1957).

[2]U.S. Congress, House, College and University Extension Act of 1940, H.R. 9701, 76th Cong., 3rd Sess., 1940; and U.S. Congress, Senate, College and University Extension Act of 1940, S. 3950, 76th Cong., 3rd Sess., 1940. See also Congressional Record, 86, pt. 5:5795 and pt; 6:5798 respectively.

noncategorical federal support for general extension programs carried out by the land-grant colleges and state universities; a "certified institution" in each state would administer the program; an institutional plan for statewide general extension would be designed; and matching funds up to 50 per cent would be required from local sources.

No congressional action was taken on these bills from 1940 to 1958, other than to send them to congressional committees. Hearings were begun in 1959 and held annually thereafter to 1963.[1] These hearings brought general extension leaders, other adult education representatives, public officials, business and labor leaders, higher education representatives, special interest group representatives, and other interested parties together at various times to offer testimony in support of the general extension concept. As diverse groups presented their views, the concept itself began to take on new dimensions: from a focus on general extension-type activities (both formal and informal programs of continuing education for adults who wanted to complete their schooling, to gain new knowledge and insights, to upgrade themselves professionally and occupationally, to become more enlightened citizens, and to make sound use of leisure time) to a broadening focus on the use of college and university resources to solve pressing social and economic problems, especially in urban and metropolitan areas; from the participation of only the large public universities to the inclusion of smaller and private institutions; and from service only to an educationally prepared clientele to service for the undereducated and disadvantaged.

Support for the concept of federal aid for general extension activities was growing, both in Congress and outside. More and more legislators added their names as sponsors,[2] testimony was solicited from a wider range of individuals and groups, and the administration added its support in 1962. The general extension bill passed the Senate in 1962[3]; by the following year it had become part of the administration's proposals for education, although it was not reported out of either House or Senate committee as the administration's proposals were fragmented into several specific aid to education measures.

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings on H.R. 357 and similar bills, Program of General Extension Education, before the Subcommittee on Special Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 86 Cong., 1st and 2nd Sess., 1959 and 1960.

[2] For example, the general extension bill was usually sponsored by one or two senators prior to 1962, but in 1962 the bill had the sponsorship of twenty-eight senators. See Congressional Record, 108, pt. 9:11799.

[3] Ibid., pt. 16:21636-38.

During 1964, President Johnson moved into action on a number of domestic fronts to implement programs proposed by President Kennedy and to establish his own record of achievement. In June, during a speech at the University of California's Irvine campus, he extolled the role that colleges and universities could play in meeting the problems of America's urban communities.[1] Early in 1965, his message on education to Congress contained a recommendation for "a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community." In this message, Johnson continued:

> The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. . . . This is a demanding assignment for the university and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.[2]

The president was referring to Title I of the proposed "Higher Education Act of 1965." The draft bill had a number of sponsors in both the House and Senate, including Rep. Adam C. Powell (N.Y.) and Rep. Edith Green (Oreg.) in the House and Sen. Wayne Morse (Oreg.) in the Senate.[3] All were ranking members of the congressional committees that would consider the administration's education proposals, and all would play important roles in obtaining passage of Title I.

The draft of Title I was called "University Extension and Continuing Education," and it departed radically from the proposed general extension bill of previous years. The purpose was to solve community problems through the strengthening of continuing education and extension methods. "State plans" for comprehensive statewide programs of extension were to be drawn up by "state agencies" representative of institutions of higher education in a particular state. State advisory councils were to be appointed where necessary. All qualified institutions were to be encouraged to participate. New and expanded programs of extension and continuing education were to be carried out. A first year matching requirement of 90-10 per cent was provided, and the first year's authorization was to be $25 million. Finally, several national advisory bodies were to be created to oversee and review the program. Thus, while Title I grew

---

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Enactments by the 88th Congress Concerning Education and Training, 1963-1964, Committee Print, 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, p. 235.

[2] Congressional Record, 111, pt. 1:600.

[3] U.S. Congress, House, Higher Education Act of 1965, H.R. 3220, 3221, 3919, 4291, 4490, and 4797, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965. See Congressional Record, 111, pt. 1:978, and pt. 2:1664, 1890, 2165, and 2523. Also, U.S. Congress, Senate, Higher Education Act of 1965, S. 600, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965. See Congressional Record, 111, pt. 1:883.

out of the concepts of the previous general extension bill, it was essentially a new design for institution-community involvement.

Led by Congresswoman Green, the House Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor questioned witnesses throughout its hearings on Title I (and the full act) about the academic level of the programs proposed, the potential clientele, the participation of community colleges and other small public and private colleges, the urban problem solving emphasis of the bill, and the federal priorities for aid to higher education.[1] The result of this probing was a redrafted Title I renamed "Community Service Programs" focusing directly on urban-suburban problem solving and raising the initial year's authorization to $50 million.[2] The revised bill was passed by the full House committee, and them by the full House on August 26, 1965 by a vote of 368-22.[3] Both Green, as chairman of the subcommittee, and Powell, as chairman of the full House committee, were instrumental in getting Title I through the House in its revised form, as indicated by their extensive remarks on the House floor during debate on the measure.[4]

The Senate Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, led by Senator Morse, heard testimony similar to that presented in the House, but questioning by the subcommittee made it apparent that the senators wanted to maintain the bill's statewide emphasis and its support for extension and continuing education methods, as the administration had proposed.[5] The Senate version of Title I as it emerged from the full committee was called "College and University Extension and Continuing Education."[6] The bill was to serve rural as well as urban and suburban areas, and extension-type programs were to be used to carry out the act's basic problem solving purpose. It passed

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings on H.R. 3220 and similar bills. Higher Education Act of 1965, before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.

[2] U.S., Congress, House, Higher Education Act of 1965, H. Rept. 621 To Accompany H.R. 9567, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.

[3] Congressional Record, 111, pt. 16:21947-48.

[4] Ibid., pt. 16:21876-81.

[5] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Hearings on S. 600. Higher Education Act of 1965, before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.

[6] U.S. Congress, Senate, Higher [illegible]cation Act of 1965, S. Rept. To Accompany H.R. 9567, 89th Cong., 1st Sess.,

the Senate by a vote of 79-3 on September 2, 1965,[1] thereby necessitating a joint House-Senate conference to resolve the differences between the two houses.

The conference committee made its report on October 19.[2] Both House and Senate leaders observed on the floors of their respective houses that the final version of Title I represented a political compromise between House and Senate advocates of their particular versions of the bill, with Congressman Powell calling the compromise "a perfect example of give and take,"[3] and Sen. Ralph Yarborough (Tex.) speaking of major differences between the House and Senate versions of Title I, adding that "a protracted discussion ensued over what the scope of the bill should be."[4]

The new name of the act, as well as many other provisions, reflected this compromise. The act was titled, "Community Service and Continuing Education Programs"; the mission was to assist in solving community problems by strengthening community service programs of colleges and universities; the geographical thrust was to be rural, urban, or suburban with particular emphasis on urban-suburban areas; a "community service program" was to include any educational program or service designed to solve community problems; the authorized life was five years, but funding was provided for only the first three years; and the first year's authorization was $25 million, with $50 million for the next two years. Most of the other provisions remained unchanged from the administration's proposals, including the state agency and state advisory council concepts, the stipulation that all qualified institutions could participate, and the call for comprehensive statewide plans.

This compromise version of Title I, along with the full act, easily passed both the House and Senate on October 20, 1965[5] and the president signed it into law on November 8, 1965. Both House and Senate leaders who had guided the bill through the legislative process claimed that they got what they wanted in Title I. Because of their basic philosophic and programmatic differences, however, the nation wound up with a bill containing various provisions capable of being interpreted in several distinct ways. The compromise bill reflected the differing

---

[1] Congressional Record, 111, pt. 17:22717.

[2] U.S. Congress, House, Committee of Conference, Higher Education Act of 1965, Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 9567, H. Rept. 1178, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.

[3] Congressional Record, 111, pt. 20:22673-74.

[4] Ibid., pt. 20:27578.

[5] Ibid., pt. 20:27609, 27697.

views present during the hearings in the House and Senate committees and evident in the remarks of the various legislators supporting the act, and it was left up to the USOE administrators and guideline writers, and to the country's adult educators, especially its extension leaders, to resolve the ambiguities of the act in their execution, implementation, and operation of the program. The USOE administrators and the adult educators in the field were being gently moved into new program areas and unique administrative ventures as they operationally unraveled what the legislators had wrought.

Some Conclusions from the Historical Phase

The first question posed for this investigation (on p. 4) related to factors present in the history of Title I which could contribute to an understanding of the program. The evidence from the primary documents associated with the legislative history of Title I leads to the following general conclusions about this historical period:

1. Although it would appear from Title I's statement of purpose that two fundamental viewpoints are embodied in the act (i.e., community problem solving and strengthening of community service programs of colleges and universities), the evidence from the historical phase of this study indicates that at least seven viewpoints towards federal aid for higher adult education were present during this period. These viewpoints emerge from the statements and testimony of witnesses in the congressional hearings, in comments and questions of legislative committee members, in remarks made by the legislators on the floor of each house, and in various committee reports. They include:

Viewpoints Centering on the Role of Extension

Cooperative Extension Viewpoint: Recognize the contributions of the Cooperative Extension Service, support its evolving role in the nation's urban areas, and avoid duplicating of and overlapping with its extensive statewide structures and services.

General Extension Viewpoint: Provide support for the general extension programs of the land-grant colleges and state universities which have served the continuing education needs of adults throughout each state, largely on a self-supporting basis.

Urban Extension Viewpoint: Establish an urban extension service, complementing the program of cooperative extension in rural and small town areas, to extend the skills and resources of the large public universities to urbanized areas in each state.

A Viewpoint Centering on the Community

Community Problem Solving Viewpoint: Provide categorical aid to meet the pressing social and economic problems of America's communities, particularly in urban-inner city areas; the nation's colleges and universities are among the many societal institutions and organizations that can contribute their resources to this effort.

A Balanced Viewpoint

Comprehensive Viewpoint: Since communities face massive social and economic problems, and since colleges and universities lack full commitment and capabilities to deal with these concerns, provide federal aid to begin to strengthen institutional resources and to begin to meet these problems without choosing to concentrate on one or the other thrust for they are mutually reinforcing.

Other Viewpoints

Special Interest Viewpoints: The concept of federal aid for higher adult education is sound, but special recognition is requested for the continuing educational needs of our institutions (e.g., the community college) and our constituents (e.g., workers, professionals) under the terms of the act.

Viewpoints Presenting Challenges: Either a) the concept of federal aid for higher adult education is sound, but more would be accomplished if we altered our approach (e.g., by establishing urban study centers, or reducing the matching requirement, or setting aside some of the money for experimental and pilot projects; or b) the basic educational system of the country is in serious trouble, and the federal government should not be concerned about supporting service activities of colleges and universities—either for continuing education or for problem solving.

2. The enactment of Title I in 1965 culminated a quarter century of effort on the part of leaders in the field of adult education, and particularly general extension, to obtain federal support for higher adult education. Two important characteristics of this period were the increasing support after 1959 in Congress and outside for the concept of federal aid for higher adult education, and a gradual broadening of the concept itself from aid for the general extension programs of the large public universities to aid for community problem solving through many institutions.

3. From the language of the Title I legislation, it might appear that the comprehensive viewpoint described above prevailed. The history of Title I as it is found in the primary congressional sources used in this study reveals that the comprehensive viewpoint was never accepted by the legislators. Title I was more the result of a political compromise between the House and Senate conferees which appeared to reconcile several conflicting viewpoints than a conscious

design by the Congress to create a balanced and flexible program for community problem solving.

THE FIELD STUDY PHASE

The Methodology

The purpose of the field study was to determine the current status of the Title I program as perceived by those individuals active in the program. This part of the investigation was conducted over a period of three months in mid-1969, though it had been preceded by a pilot study conducted in the investigator's home state. By this time, the national Title I program was nearing the end of its fourth year, with two more years authorized.

From the literature dealing with Title I (journal articles, annual reports, state reports), from informal conversations with Title I officials, and from personal involvement in Title I programs, the investigator determined that there are four basic roles performed in the program—administrator, advisory council member, institutional representative, and project director. It was assumed, therefore, that gathering data from individuals performing in each of these roles would provide insights into the current status of the Title I program. The number of respondents interviewed in the field study and the roles they performed are shown in Table 1. The quest in the field study phase was for information from

TABLE 1

FIELD STUDY RESPONDENTS

Location	Number Interviewed	Roles			
		Administrators	Advisory Council Members	Institutional Representatives	Project Directors
Federal Government (Washington, D.C.)	10	5	5	—	—
State X *	15	3	2	5	5
State Y *	15	2	5	4	4
State Z *	18	3	2	4	9
Pilot Study	6	1	1	3	1
Totals	64	14	15	16	19

*The states visited have been coded X, Y, and Z to preserve their anonymity.

individuals performing in diverse roles under Title I in three specific states and in the federal government; it was not to examine the dimensions of any state program. Nor was the field study designed to sample from the larger population of states with Title I programs, even though the roles examined represent the range of roles performed under Title I in almost every state.

The results of the pilot study indicated that an open-ended interviewing approach with individuals performing in the four roles could yield data to answer the questions posed by this study. In addition, the interview schedule was checked for validity, and several questions were changed as a result. Reliability checks, including cross-checking questions, were also employed in the pilot study throughout the field study. The pilot study also served as a check on the interviewer's objectivity, with an outside judge examining the tape recordings for any systematic bias. Finally, to prepare for the field interviewing, the investigator undertook a rigorous training program to enable him to use the technique effectively; this training included a review of the principles of interviewing,[1] conversations with experts in this skill area, and critiques of the tape recordings from the pilot study.

The next step was the selection of individuals performing in the four roles, both at the national level and in several states, to obtain a range of perspectives on the Title I program. Five USOE administrators and five government members of the national advisory council were selected as respondents on the federal level. The three states selected for field study visits met six criteria: each had evolved a different form for its state agency (a bureau of higher education, a land-grant university, and an agency for community affairs); each had at least one major metropolitan area with several public and private colleges and universities; each had a state advisory council; each had conducted a sizeable number of Title I projects; each had encouraged the participation of a number of institutions; and each was geographically accessible to the interviewer. These states, therefore, were sufficiently dissimilar in their administrative forms to ensure diversity of programming among them, but had large enough programs with similarities on the other criteria to warrant comparisons.

Almost all the interview sessions were conducted in the respondents' offices (95 per cent), and all but four were tape recorded. Transcripts were made from these tapes; these transcripts along with notes taken on the other four interviews and postinterview reflections on the part of the interviewer

[1] See Robert F. Kahn and Charles F. Cannell, The Dynamics of Interviewing (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957).

constituted the data from which the field study findings were drawn. These data were subjected to both quantitative and qualitative content analysis, following several basic sources on this analytic technique.[1] The quantitative analysis included taking a single respondent as the unit of enumeration to enable the investigator to make quantitative statements regarding the number of respondents who raised a specific issue or who took a specific position on an aspect of Title I. The qualitative analysis included reading and rereading of the transcripts to determine categories and concepts used to explain the field study data; coding of items from the transcripts; observations about the respondents and their comments on Title I; and the analysis and summary of the field study results. The reporting of these results included tables, illustrations, and direct quotations to document the patterns and uniformities, along with the diversities of the Title I field status.

Title I in Action: Perspectives from the Field

General Reactions to the Title I Effort.—Several questions on the interview schedule were designed to allow the respondent to expound on Title I as an act, a concept, and a program in very general terms. The results were mixed, with 77 per cent of the respondents expressing either enthusiasm or acceptance of Title I, and only a few expressing either disappointment or an unfavorable attitude. Other than the Title I administrators who appeared to be especially enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the act and its program, no differentiation could be detected by role performed. In contrast, 41 per cent of the respondents, spread across all roles, felt that Title I had not had an impact, and had not had a persuasive effect on the public or on the federal government. Some respondents (38 per cent) blamed Title I's relative obscurity on the lack of a distinct identity, on the inability of those involved in the program to generate a viable, articulate constituency (38 per cent), on the difficulty of measuring programs such as Title I either on a national level or or state and local levels (45 per cent), or finally, on combinations of these factors, each reinforcing the other. The difference between respondent enthusiasm for Title I both as an act and a program, and the feeling among a sizeable number of respondents that Title I had not had an impact seems to point to a gap between expectation and promise on the one hand, and actual accomplishments on the other.

---

[1] See, for example, Alexander L. George, "Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Content Analysis," in Ithiel De Sola Pool (ed.), Trends in Content Analysis (Urbana, Ill.: The University of Illinois Press, 1959).

Still, respondents reported a variety of program outcomes. Closely following Title I's statement of purpose, approximately two-thirds of the respondents cited increased institution-community involvement as a major outcome, and over one-half felt the Title I projects had assisted in solving some acute community problems. Most of the latter came from the ranks of the institutional representatives and project directors. Other benefits cited included assistance to extension divisions (38 per cent); involvement of individual administrators, faculty, and students (33 per cent); inter-institutional cooperation (13 per cent); and increased cooperation among community groups and organizations (13 per cent). Specific projects were also mentioned, ranging from statewide law enforcement seminars to consumer buying courses for inner-city residents, from workshops for newly elected small town officials to films on open housing in a major urban-suburban area. Title I had tackled, in the words of one respondent, "some really tough community problems."

Special Problems Related to Interpretation of the Act.—The respondents raised a number of special problems which appeared to be based on diverse interpretations of the legislation, especially centering on how each respondent tended todefine Title I's basic objectives, or mission. As one respondent observed, "it has as many definers as people you ask." Some respondents looked upon Title I as a community problem solving program (27 per cent); some thought it was to develop long-term community service and problem solving efforts in local communities (23 per cent); some perceived it as an institution support program to strengthen the capabilities of institutions for community service (33 per cent); and others refused to isolate one or the other objective, preferring to view community problem solving and institution strengthening as complementary thrusts which reinforced each other (11 per cent). These interpretations of Title I's basic mission were spread across all roles examined; as no pattern emerged, it was obvious that individuals responsible for some aspect of Title I working out of the same office or institution, or serving on the same agency or advisory council, could not agree on this fundamental concern.

Respondents were equally divided on their views of other Title I provisions: 25 per cent, primarily from states Y and Z, thought the program should be directed to urban-inner city problems and 23 per cent, once again primarily from states Y and Z, wanted more emphasis on statewide problems. Since both states Y and Z were in the process of tightening their priorities for Title I, these results may

mirror the debates in these states over the recent moves to narrow the effort. On the nature of a clientele for Title I, 13 per cent thought it should reach the educationally prepared--the traditional general extension clientele; 22 per cent wanted to reach the undereducated adult; and 11 per cent felt the program would have greatest impact in working with community leaders and decision-makers. On the question of appropriate formats, 44 per cent spread across all roles wanted more emphasis on innovative problem solving formats; 27 per cent wanted greater emphasis on proven extension and continuing education formats (courses, conferences, workshops); and 22 per cent thought the projects should have a research component.

The act was unclear as to who should set priorities for the program, and the question rests on whether the enabling legislation is perceived as categorical and directed on the one hand, or noncategorical general support on the other. As long as differences existed over what Title I's basic mission should be, there would be differences over who should exercise influence over whom. Title I appears to have evolved into a state grant program, with the USOE playing a nondirective role in priority setting. And in two of the three states visited (Y and Z), the state agencies were in the process of tightening their Title I priorities to focus resources on urban-inner city problems. Given the flexible nature of priority setting under Title I, therefore, it was not surprising to find respondents divided on the issue. Thus, they could not decide whether it was better to have greater federal government influence over the Title I effort (25 per cent--most of whom came from among the federal officials interviewed), or whether less federal influence was desirable (30 per cent--most of whom came from state Y where a recent controversy had arisen over the reported imposition by the USOE of an "urban observatory" in Lake City[1]). They also divided on whether state authorities should have more influence (41 per cent) or less (34 per cent); and on whether local institutions (27 per cent) and the local communities (14 per cent) should have a greater voice in Title I policy-making. Another pattern that seemed to emerge by role performed was one that reflected perhaps the traditional autonomy of the university and other institutions of higher education: almost all of the respondents who thought the state agency had too much influence came from among the institutional representatives and project directors, and these same individuals made up the bulk of those who thought local institutions had an insufficient voice in the program.

---

[1]The "urban observatory" is a joint Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)-Title I venture which is attempting to place university-based research and planning centers in a number of major urban areas. Some of the respondents in this study did not believe that this was a proper use of scarce Title I resources. Both states Y (Lake City) and Z (Western City) were to receive urban observatories.

Special Problems Related to Funding, Administering, and Advising Under Title I.—Some problems raised by the respondents appeared to be related to congressional budgeting for Title I, to administrative decisions and policy-making, and to advisory council functions. Almost all respondents agreed that the level of congressional appropriations for the Title I program was too low to carry out the purposes of the act (77 per cent), and one-half pointed out that the annual, discontinuous nature of federal budgeting resulted in the single project approach (or "project-itis" as some termed it) and seriously interfered with the ability of the states and the institutions participating in Title I to mount effective projects because the nature of community problem solving and institution building requires a long-term, continuous effort. These budgeting problems led some respondents to the conclusion that the federal government was not serious about Title I, and was unconcerned with the program.

The reportedly inadequate funding level for Title I also affected the nature of the state agency distribution of Title I money; with scarce resources for local projects, and with the act's provision for widespread institutional participation, many respondents (53 per cent) complained about the "political distribution" of the Title I dollars to many institutions around the state, or about "conflicts of interest" whereby extension officials were sitting in judgment on their own proposals. These comments came from individuals performing in all the roles studied, and were heard from almost all the state Y respondants. It appears that the University of Y Extension, as the state agency, had made a determined effort to spread the Title I funds around the state to avoid charges of discrimination against other institutions in the state.

College and university participation in the Title I program came under scrutiny from still another angle. Some respondents (18 per cent) thought too many colleges and universities were participating in the Title I program, and others (18 per cent) thought that the smaller colleges and universities should be accorded greater opportunities for participation than they had received to date. Once again, no pattern by role performed emerged. Many respondents (64 per cent), however, spoke of definite constraints operating on institutions of higher education which kept these institutions from becoming full participants in the Title I problem solving effort. These constraints included the difficulties of getting institutionwide support for service and problem solving activities; a faculty-reward system biased towards research and publication (faculty participating in Title I projects do not seem to have taken advantage of the opportunities these projects offer for publication); and among the smaller colleges, the lack of staff

and other resources to perform service functions and to compete with the large public universities. Some respondents (34 per cent) mentioned also the constraints operating on extension divisions, such as staff unprepared for community problem solving functions and a preoccupation with traditional general extension practices and formats; the barriers that exist for full institution-community understanding (25 per cent), such as projects not related to community concern , and inter-institutional conflicts (39 per cent), mentioned mainly by state Y respondents who were referring to the problems associated with the inter-institutional committee established in Lake City to bring institutions together in cooperative problem solving efforts. Finally, 39 per cent of the respondents, especially the institutional representatives, thought that the 50 per cent matching requirement in the third year of the program was prohibitive, particularly for the smaller institutions which did not have access to what some respondents termed "hard funds" to meet the match.

Administrative and advisory council structures also came in for a share of criticism from the respondents. Some (22 per cent) took the USOE to task for bureaucratic practices, with three of the five USOE administrators voicing this sentiment. Other complaints about federal level administrative practices included the lack of communication and coordination with the field (23 per cent), the unclear USOE guidelines for the Title I program (16 per cent), and the fact that Title I was in the wrong office (8 per cent)—most felt it should be in the Bureau of Higher Education. State level administrators also came in for some criticism. Respondents spoke of state agency bureaucratic practices (41 per cent), including delays in funding, inefficiency, and undue paperwork; poor coordination and communication with the participating colleges and universities (11 per cent); and restrictive state agency guidelines out of step with university policy and university calendars (33 per cent). Most of these concerns were raised by the institutional representatives and the project directors.

Only a few respondents (9 per cent) even mentioned the national advisory council; they questioned its effectiveness in helping to set national policy, but they differed on whether this perceived ineffectiveness was due to the lack of staff and a budget for the council or to the makeup of the council membership—both the education people and the federal government officials on the council received their share of criticism. A number of respondents (27 per cent), including five of the nine state advisory council members interviewed, felt that the state council was ineffective in helping to establish policy directions for Title I, and that the representatives from the large institutions tended to

dominate the council meetings. However, of the respondents (17 per cent) who thought the state council to be unrepresentative of statewide interests, only one turned out to be a council member.

The Future of the Title I Program.—The final field study subject on which data were gathered was the respondents' perceptions of the future of the program. They offered many suggestions for change in the program, including such procedural devices as narrowing the act's focus to one or two major problem areas; providing for longer-term, continuous funding from the federal government for sustained, systematic community service and problem solving efforts; and encouraging increased participation from consortia of institutions, community colleges, students, and community groups. Other proposals would have altered Title I's policy and programs through systems approaches to problem solving, new administrative and advisory structures, and such project ideas as action research and surveys, sensitivity training, and merging Title I efforts with the Model Cities program. Still other changes proposed would have drastically altered the Title I effort to transform it into an urban extension service, let industry do the problem solving tasks, or bypass state governments with direct federal-institution grants.

In contrast to their enthusiastic acceptance of the act and its programs, 50 per cent of the respondents thought the program would have trouble surviving, whereas 41 per cent expressed some hope for its future. The still hopeful pointed to the Vietnam War and to misplaced national priorities, hoping to hold on until the peace dividend became available for domestic purposes. The pessimistic based their views on the lack of congressional and administrative enthusiasm and support for Title I, or on the fact that universities could not help local communities in their struggles with the power structure in any case because of the political nature of these activities.

Some Conclusions from the Field Study Phase

The second question posed for this investigation (on p. 5) related to factors present in the opinions and attitudes of individuals holding some responsibility for the Title I program in the field. Before discussing the general conclusions which follow from the field study results, however, it should be noted that there are limitations to the generalization of the results of this study to Title I programs in other than the three states studied because the field study was not designed to sample the full spectrum of states with Title I

programs. On the other hand, some cautious generalizations could perhaps be ventured based on the presence in other states of the four roles examined in this study, on the similarities in perceptions between the federal government officials and the state Title I people interviewed, and on the familiarity displayed by many of the respondents, especially the state administrators and the institutional representatives, for Title I programs in other areas because of attendance at regional and national conferences, journal articles, a sharing of state reports, and personal communication with colleagues inother aress.

Given these limitations, the field study results lead to the following general conclusions about the Title I field operations and status:

1. Four years after the enactment of the Title I legislation, individuals responsible for some aspect of the program as administrators, advisory council members, institutional representatives, and project directors appeared to hold at least eight fundamental viewpoints towards Title I and federal aid for higher adult education in general. These viewpoints are

Viewpoints Centering on the Institution

Institution Building and Strengthening Viewpoint: Federal aid should be institutional support for the long-term development, strengthening, and maintenance of the community service and continuing education programs and activities of the colleges and universities.

General Extension/Urban Extension Viewpoint: Since Title I's thrust is urban-oriented, an urban extension service should be established through the urban campuses and offices of the large public universities with urban agents and urban research centers following the pattern of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Viewpoints Centering on the Community

Pragmatic Community Problem Solving Viewpoint: Federal and state intervention is necessary to mount highly categorical, action programs to assist in the solution of local community problems, and Title I is one of the many federal programs that can contribute to these efforts.

Developmental Community Service and Continuing Education Viewpoint: Gradual progress and long-term development of community service and continuing education efforts are needed to utilize fully the resources of colleges and universities in systematic approaches to community needs.

A Balanced Viewpoint

Comprehensive Viewpoint: Title I's objective is to solve community problems, but this objective can best be fulfilled under the program by strengthening the community service programs of colleges and universities—these thrusts are reciprocal and mutually reinforcing and should not be isolated from each other.

Other Viewpoints

Special Interest Viewpoints: The concept is laudable, but the program to date has underplayed or ignored the needs of certain institutions (e.g., the small private college, the community college) or certain actual or potential clienteles (e.g., the undereducated and disadvantaged, the community leadership).

Academic Administrator Viewpoint: Title I is an additional source of funding to further the interests of an institution or support a a favorite project of a faculty member or administrator; other broader aspects of the Title I program are secondary.

Skeptical Viewpoints: Either there are a) certain aspects of Title I that are bothersome (e.g., the inclusion of all qualified institutions, the matching funds provision); or b) the concept itself should be questioned (e.g., because universities can not join in political advocacy, because Congress is not serious about solving community problems).

2. In spite of its varied and diverse accomplishments—a national pattern of state agencies and advisory councils, widespread institutional participation, reports of increased institution-community involvement, and assistance in helping to solve some community problems—the Title I program does not seem to have made much of an impact either on institutions or on communities, and does not seem to have visibility either in the Congress or the administation—if one can judge by its low level of funding and its precarious future. The problem of determining the impact of the program is related to the diversity of viewpoints present in the field, because each viewpoint would require a different way to measure results. Thus, the lack of agreement on Title I's objectives and basic mission seems to have resulted in an incapacity on the part of those responsible for the program to assess its outcomes and achievements. And if the outcomes can not be adequately measured, if efforts are being expended in a number of different directions, and if those responsible for the program are all saying different things regarding the nature of Title I, then the program's outline and thrust will continue to be uncertain and blurred to those in Congress and the administration who can affect the status of Title I.

3. The Title I program has not received sufficient funds from Congress to allow it effectively to carry out its multiple functions of assisting in the solution of community problems, supporting the community service programs of colleges and universities, establishing a comprehensive and coordinated statewide network of community service programs, encouraging the participation of all qualified institutions within a state, and maintaining a national advisory council to oversee and review the Title I program and other federal government extension activities.

Some Final Conclusions: Title I in Retrospect

The final question posed for this study (on p. 5) dealt with the results of the two distinct phases of the investigation; specifically, it was concerned with the contrast between the factors emerging from the history of Title I and the factors present in the perspectives held by individuals responsible for the program four years after enactment. The same limitations on the generalization of these conclusions to other state Title I programs still hold. Thus, contrasting the results of the two phases of this study leads to the following general conclusions about the Title I experience:

1. A comparison of the viewpoints present in the historical development of Title I and those present in the opinions and attitudes of field personnel four years after enactment reveals that these viewpoints were essentially parallel, as shown in Table 2. Although the viewpoints appeared in slightly

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF VIEWPOINTS

From the Historical Phase	From the Field Study Phase
Viewpoints Centering on Extension	Viewpoints Centering on the Institution
Cooperative Extension General Extension Urban Extension	Institution Building and Strengthening General Extension/Urban Extension
A Viewpoint Centering on the Community	Viewpoints Centering on the Community
Community Problem Solving	Pragmatic Community Problem Solving Developmental Community Service and Continuing Education
A Balanced Viewpoint	A Balanced Viewpoint
Comprehensive	Comprehensive
Other Viewpoints	Other Viewpoints
Special Interests Presenting Challenges	Special Interests Academic Administrator Skeptical

altered form in the field, the basic premises upon which they were based remained. That is, individuals either assumed that institutional capability for community service and continuing education was lacking and had to be strengthened before major programs could be mounted, or they assumed that the capabilities were there and only had to be tapped for the community service and continuing education functions. Or, in the case of the comprehensive viewpoint, individuals continued to assume the automatic duality of the community problem solving and institution building thrusts.

2. The continuing presence of highly diverse viewpoints in the field after four years of programming experience demonstrates that the enactment of Title I and its subsequent implementation and administration failed to resolve the basic conflicts present at the time the act became law. The viewpoints, as they were held in the field, were well-balanced with strong enough forces operating to keep any one viewpoint from prevailing. Thus, the legislation's potential for flexibility became one of its greatest drawbacks in reality; the inability of the field personnel to agree on what the program was designed to accomplish was compounded by the inadequacy of congressional appropriations and the annual federal budgeting cycle. The result was a plethora of small, isolated projects none of which alone could have a sustained impact on a community problem.

3. The conflict between the House and Senate in 1965 over whether Title I was a categorical federal program with the specific task of solving certain urban-suburban community problems, or whether it was a noncategorical institution support program with a statewide emphasis was not resolved four years after enactment. The Title I program appears to have been acknowledged as a state grant effort by the federal officials, with state-determined priorities. And until recently, it appears to have been interpreted by state authorities as a modified institution support effort, with broad state guidelines and some flexibility for local initiative. Recent moves in two of the states visited to tighten priorities for urban problem solving have brought the program closer to the House's thrust for categorical aid, and the urban observatory concept being implemented in these same two states was a federally initiated venture. Both of these moves towards directed aid have drawn criticism from state and local Title I people, thereby substantiating the previous conclusion that the chances for consensus on what Title I should do appear slim—given the present field status of the program.

4. The legislation itself was found to be somewhat contradictory with regard to institutional participation in the Title I program. To solve community

problems with the resources of the colleges and universities, it would have been logical to enlist the support of those institutions with established programs of service and extension. But the act called for the participation of all qualified institutions in a state, and for strengthening those that did not have the capabilities for community service. Thus, the community problem solving thrust was tempered by the institution participation and institution strengthening provisions.

5. Title I may not survive in its present form, given the diversity of viewpoints held by those responsible for the program, unless some broad-based policy changes are made or unless some focusing takes place to clarify the Title I mission and to concentrate resources for stronger impact and for increased visibility of outcomes for both the Congress and the administration.

Recommendations for Policy Changes in the Title I Program

Several policy alternatives are suggested in this section, leading from the final conclusion stated in the preceding paragraph. These recommendations are directed primarily to those responsible for policy decisions at the federal government level, although state administrators and other state level decision makers under Title I could profit from an acceptance of these suggestions as alternatives to present policy—keeping in mind the previously stressed limitations to generalization beyond the three states studied.

The field study phase of this investigation was completed in mid-1969; from an analysis of the results and from the conclusions drawn from these results, several recommendations would have been feasible at that time. These recommmendations would have dealt with measures for strengthening the program's impact and for increasing its visibility and developing a constituency in Congress and in the administration. The main thrust of these recommendations would have been to attempt to resolve some of the diversity present in the field, especially with regard to Title I's basic mission and objectives.

The Political Realities of Mid-1970.— The political realities of mid-1970 within the Congress and the administration, however, are not the same as they were when the field study phase of this investigation was completed in mid-1969. Thus, any recommendations for policy change have to be based on these new realities. The president has recommended the termination of the Title I program in its present form, and he did not include a line item for Title I in his fiscal 1971 budget proposals. The House Appropriations Committee, however, restored Title I's

$9.5 million funding level for fiscal 1971, and the committee's action was subsequently approved in the full House. It is expected that the Senate will take similar action, thereby extending the Title I program through June 30, 1971.

The president may well make a determined effort after the upcoming November, 1970 elections to advance his administration's proposals for higher education, including Title I, which are contained in a bill introduced on March 24, 1970 by Rep. Albert H. Quie (Minn.) called the "Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1970."[1] The bill amends Title I of the "Higher Education Act of 1965" through a proposal to establish a National Foundation on Higher Education, and proposes to alter or eliminate many of the categorical federal aid programs in higher education enacted in the previous administration. Some of these programs would fall within the framework of the proposed national foundation, and it is possible that the concept of community service and continuing education programs could be among these programs. As of this writing, no hearings have been held on the Quie bill.

In contrast to the administration's proposals for higher education and Title I, Rep. Edith Green (Oreg.) has introduced her "Omnibus Postsecondary Education Act of 1970," a bill to extend the present authority of Title I and other categorical higher education programs through June 30, 1974.[2] The bill proposes a continuation of Title I's present authorization of $60 million (from the higher education amendments of 1968) for each of the three fiscal years. Hearings on Green's bill are currently in progress. Thus, two conflicting views of how the federal government should support higher education in the coming years are now before Congress, and it is expected that a resolution of this issue will come about before the expiration of Title I and other higher education programs on July 1, 1971.

Given this situation in the federal government, those who have been active for years in extension and adult education in general, as well as those who have become interested in community service and continuing education through Title I, must decide whether to struggle within the framework of the administration's proposed national foundation for continued funding of community service programs, or mobilize in support of Congresswoman Green's bill for continuation of the present program. In either case, these individuals would do well to unite on a common point of view or strategy and consolidate their efforts. From the results

---

[1] U.S. Congress, House, Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1970, H.R. 16621, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1970. See Congressional Record, 116, no. 46, p. H2366.

[2] U.S. Congress, House, The Omnibus Postsecondary Education Act of 1970, H.R. 16098, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., 1970. See Congressional Record, 116, no. 22, p. H1145.

of the present investigation, and given these political realities, it would seem that the following recommendations merit attention from those who control Title I policy:

1. The disharmony of viewpoints about the nature of Title I present in the field situation of the program should be resolved through the general acceptance of a dominant viewpoint. Title I appears to have been an innovative program for the federal government with no previous patterns to follow and no prototype institutions and services to build upon. The general extension and community development activities of the large public universities had taken these institutions into their communities, but not on the scale implied in Title I for problem solving in major urban and inner city areas. But, based on the results of this investigation, Title I does not seem to have been successful; the hoped-for structures and mechanisms for community problem solving implied in the provisions of the legislation have not arisen, and a major contributing factor was the continuing diversity of viewpoints held by those who are responsible for the program's progress.

2. Of the eight viewpoints present in the Title I field situation, only one—the comprehensive viewpoint—has the capacity to resolve the disharmony, and it is this viewpoint that should be accepted as the logical unifying element. The opportunity exists with the adoption of this viewpoint to attempt consciously to solve community problems on a long-term, sustained basis by making certain that all such efforts also assist the colleges and universities with their capabilities to service their communities on a continuing basis. Thus, prototype institutions and services will be developed and strengthened in the process of working on complex community problems. The operationalization of this concept in the Title I program faces the twin obstacles of overcoming resistance from individuals who adhere to the other viewpoints, and carrying out a complex function with limited resources.

3. One way to overcome the obstacles of individual conflict and inadequate resources is to establish a series of major pilot projects which embrace the comprehensive viewpoint. These pilot projects should be carried out in selected target areas with rigorous and systematic criteria for programming, with well-defined objectives, with contracts let to institutions or consortia of institutions to develop and execute these pilot projects, and with evaluative devices built in. The experience of the Cooperative Extension Service, for example, indicates that the Smith-Lever funds were used to extend existing structures and services that

had been shown to be successful models; the service itself came into being only after years of trial and error. As the proposed pilot projects get underway, the most promising should be granted continuation funds for long-term development, and the models should be expanded to other areas, other clienteles, and other institutions as was done under cooperative extension.

4. Any such pilot projects accepting and implementing the comprehensive viewpoint should encompass several additional factors which emerge from the findings of this investigation. It is further recommended, therefore, that Title I administrators and others responsible for the program consider expressions by the field study respondents for alterations in the faculty reward system to obtain greater faculty teaching and research involvement in local communities; for recognition of the potential of the smaller colleges, particularly the community college, for community work; for increased involvement of students in community service projects; and for greater encouragement of the consortia-of-institutions' approach.

5. Ultimately, the policy direction for the Title I program, which it seems to have lacked in the past because of the conflict of viewpoints, must be worked out by the program's administrators and those who sit on the national advisory council and state advisory councils. With regard to these councils, it is recommended that (a) Congress provide a budget for the national advisory council to hire staff and carry out its dual mission with greater effectiveness than in the past; and (b) the state agencies and administrators review the membership and functions of their state advisory councils to make certain that these bodies are competent with a voice in policy-making on the nature and direction of the Title I program.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

For Theory and Practice in Adult Education

The present study has investigated several aspects of a complex piece of national legislation and the programs carried out under its provisions. By choosing to examine the history of Title I through primary legislative documents and its field status four years later through field interviews conducted in three states and in Washington, D.C., the investigator has chosen only two points of entry to probe the mass of data associated with the Title I phenomenon. There are obviously many more points at which an investigation of Title I could begin.

The investigation was one in a series of studies establishing a line of inquiry into recent federal-aid-to-education policy, and as such, constitutes part of a useful line of research for both theory and practice. Where little

prior research is available, descriptions and ordering of data as well as naming the properties of things can be useful for subsequent theory building.[1] The descriptions, analyses, and concepts presented in the present study, therefore, have value in the heuristic sense in that they constitute the type of data from which hypotheses can be generated, and from which models or theories of federal aid for higher adult education, of federal-state relationships in this area, and of institution-community involvement can be developed.

In the realm of practice in the field of adult education, the results of the present study may offer policy-and decision-makers under the Title I program some insights and some operational alternatives as the act nears the end of its present legislative life. Even though not everyone would agree with the conclusions and recommendations presented in this document, it is important that studies of the prospects and problems of national programs such as Title I be conducted in their early programming years in order to capitalize on their ongoing sense of momentum, and when there is still time to bring the loose ends of the program together. The value of this type of study could be contrasted with the relative absence of such research on the founding and early years of other federally supported adult education programs, including the Cooperative Extension Service and the national adult basic education program. Such examination of current history—that is, at the time of enactment of enabling legislation and in the early programming years—can be influential in providing the information upon which future policy can be built.

For Further Study

Because this study continued a line of research which has shown that a combination of documentary search and interview techniques can be effectively used in tandem to gather data on complex national and state educational programs, the investigator was able to examine and synthesize two distinct aspects of the Title I experience. The result was a more comprehensive analysis of the Title I program than could have been accomplished by using either of the techniques independently. Nevertheless, the combined methodological approach, as it was used in this study, could have possibly been supplemented if the testimonial evidence gathered through the documentary search-interview approach had been accompanied by: (a) in the historical phase, the examination of secondary sources pertaining to the legislative progress of the general extension bill and Title I; and (b) in

[1] For a recent discussion of this point, see Robert Dubin, Theory Building (New York: The Free Press, 1969).

the field study phase, the examination of state plans, guidelines, project proposals, and state agency reports; the interviewing of individuals not directly associated with Title I, such as legislators, some university administrators, and state officials--all familiar with but not directly involved in Title I; and the observation of Title I projects, state advisory council meetings, state agency staff meetings, national advisory council meetings, and USOE staff meetings. Further research into the nature of important adult education programs could benefit by a consideration of the elaboration of the documentary search-interview methodological approach.

Other approaches would also be useful. One study underway, for instance, includes the depth examination of the role of the general extension and other adult educators as they struggled to obtain federal support for higher adult education between 1940 and 1965.[1] Following the lead of Bailey and Mosher, an examination could be made into the administrative effort in 1966 to implement the Title I act on a national scale. It might also be helpful to examine the progress of the program between the time of enactment to the time of the present field study, either on the national level or in the states.[2]

The current status of the program could be determined in a number of ways. Comparative studies of the Title I situation in other states should be undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the program in each, to develop cross-state criteria for evaluation purposes, and to provide information for policy direction.[3] Attempts should also be made to determine the effects of the Title I program on local institutions of higher education and on local communities. Investigations should also be made into the advantages and disadvantages of the constraints operating on colleges and universities for community problem solving and service activities. The existence of the fundamental viewpoints developed in the present study should be further validated by examining the opinions and attitudes of individuals in other states performing roles similar to those examined in the present study.

---

[1]See, for example, Kleis' previously cited research project which deals with one aspect of the behavior of these leaders.

[2]See, for example, James M. Young, "Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965: Its Legislative Background and Its Implementation in Kansas" (Ph.D. dissertation in progress, University of Kansas).

[3]See, for example, Senecal's previously cited research on the implementation of Title I in Iowa.

A CONCLUDING NOTE

The Title I legislation emerged from Congress in 1965 the result of a political compromise between House and Senate leaders which appeared to reconcile several diverse viewpoints about the nature of federal aid for higher adult education. The net effect of this compromise was that the act's provisions had to be unraveled, clarified, and given operational meaning through the program's implementation and administration in the field. Bailey and Mosher, in their discussion of the implementation of the ESEA of 1965, refer to the "kaleidoscopic nature of the policy-making process in the American society," and point out that

> even when a statute leaves much to administrative discretion, the manner in which it will be executed may be anticipated from a knowledge of the relevant policy issues, the key political actors and interest groups, and the past performance of the agency. . . .[1]

Their observations, although directed to the ESEA, hold an element of truth for Title I and probably many other aid to education measures. The viewpoints developed in the course of the historical phase of this study continued to be present in slightly altered form in the field four years later and reflect the basic policy issues associated with Title I. The general extension leaders and other adult education spokesmen who were active in obtaining federal aid for higher adult education continued to play active and important roles in the Title I program four years after enactment. It was only in the agency--the USOE--that this conceptual approach breaks down because there had been no past performance in this agency in the areas encompassed by Title I. Thus, the USOE administrators (and those who wrote the guidelines for Title I) had an opportunity in the implementation stage to provide new policy direction for the nation's colleges and universities in community problem solving. That opportunity is once again presenting itself as Congress and the administration deliberate on the future of Title I in the coming months. USOE initiative, along with that of the national advisory council, the state administrators, and the national associations in adult education, can help to mobilize support both in the field and in the federal government for a unified viewpoint and a common policy towards federal aid for higher adult education. Such a unity of approach might serve to avoid further congressional compromising and subsequent diffusion of the Title I program. The result could be the foundation upon which a permanent federal support effort for higher education-based community service and continuing education activities might be built.

---

[1] Bailey and Mosher, pp. 206 and 98 respectively.

ERIC Clearinghouse
SEP 12 1970
on Adult Education